

REMARKS

Initially, Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Mancho for his time and suggestions in the May 28, 2004 telephone interview held with Applicant's undersigned attorney. As described in more detail below, Applicant has amended the claims to clarify distinctions over the cited art and to correct potential problems in the claim language that were noted by the Examiner.

Claims 1-19 are pending, including independent claims 1, 6, 11 and 16-19. Claim 16 remains allowed, but claims 1-15 and 17-19 are again rejected.

Claims 1-10, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Kaplan in view of Fig. 11 of the present application. Applicant has further amended the claims to clarify certain distinctions over the cited art, as explained in more detail below.

Applicant's invention is generally directed to more effective ways of presenting POI information on a displayed map image of a vehicle navigation system. Independent claims 1 and 17 describe a method and a system, respectively, for displaying POIs on a map image in each of a plurality of categories by using a distinctive icon for each category, and then displaying the particular type of POI within a category when a specific POI icon is selected on the map image. Thus, the use of a common icon for a category facilitates recognition of the locations on the map image of various POIs in a particular category, yet the particular type of POI within the category can be found easily, when desired, in an orderly fashion.

Independent claims 6 and 18 describe a method and a system, respectively, for displaying by a common icon on a map image only those POIs in a category having a preset type, and displaying the type of POI when a specific POI icon is selected. This embodiment provides the advantages of the first embodiment described above and, in addition, reduces unnecessary clutter on the display by not displaying POI icons for types of POI in a category that the user knows beforehand he or she does not want.

Applicant's claimed invention is not disclosed by the cited art. Kaplan describes a system and method that allows a user to specify a type of point of interest at which the user wishes to make an intermediate stop while on route to a final destination (see

Abstract; col. 1, line 66 to col. 2, line 9). Kaplan does not provide different icons for different POI categories displayed on a map image as does Applicant's invention. To the contrary, Kaplan simply displays a generic mark (i.e., an "X") at the location of all POIs (see Figs. 3, 16). Fig. 11 of the present application shows a conventional display in which POIs in categories are represented by different icons, but does not show that the particular type of POI within a category is displayed when a POI icon is selected on the map image.

In the May 28th telephone interview, Applicant's attorney pointed out that in Applicant's invention, "POIs from two or more categories can be displayed on the map," whereas Kaplan only displays POIs in one category at any given time. The Examiner noted that the claim language does not explicitly state that the POIs from two or more categories can be displayed at the same time, so that Kaplan meets the claim language because Kaplan can display different categories at different times. To overcome this issue, claims 1, 6, 17 and 18 are now amended to recite that POIs from two or more categories can be displayed on the map at the same time. Applicant's attorney also pointed out that the POI icons for different categories in Alpine's invention are "visually distinct," whereas Kaplan only uses one icon, an "X." The Examiner noted that "visually distinct" can mean that the icons merely are separated visually on the map and not necessarily different. To overcome this issue, claims 1, 6, 17 and 18 are now amended to recite that POI icons for different categories are different instead of "visually distinct."

To further clarify the invention in independent claims 1, 6, 17 and 18, the claims are also amended to expressly recite that at least some POI categories can be further differentiated by type (e.g., see application at p. 4, lines 21-26 for support), to provide clearer antecedent basis for subsequent claim language. Also, Applicant has amended the last limitation in these claims to state that the type of POI within a category is displayed "when a POI icon from the map image is selected." This is an important feature. With this feature, a user can easily determine the map locations of POIs in a particular category, then determine the specific type of POI within the category by selecting the POI icon on the map image. This feature is not at all described in Kaplan or shown in Fig. 11 of the present application. Indeed, Kaplan actually operates in an opposite way than Applicant's invention. In Kaplan, a user first uses various menus to

select a desired POI category (Figs. 5 and 6) as well as a desired type of category (Figs. 7-9). On the map image of Kaplan, only POIs of the requested type are shown (Fig. 16). Thus, because Kaplan only displays one POI type at one time on the map image, Kaplan does not need and does not describe a feature as in Applicant's claimed invention, which provides an orderly way to determine the type of POI within a category represented by an icon on the map image. [On a related point, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's assertion that the drawings in the present application do not show different POI icons for different POI categories at the same time. Figs. 1A and 8A show multiple different POI icons being displayed on the map at the same time.]


Claims 11-15 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Kaplan. Applicant disagrees with this rejection. Independent claims 11 and 19 describe a method and a system, respectively, for displaying a list including at least one POI located on the map image in a predetermined area defined by a cursor as well as a specific location on the map image corresponding to a cursor point. The user can select either a particular POI or the location corresponding to the cursor point from the list. This embodiment is useful when the scale of the displayed map is small or the density of POIs is large, so that a list of POIs in a map area designated by the cursor and a location on the map corresponding to the cursor point itself (e.g., at the cross intersection of a cursor) are displayed, and the desired POI or the location corresponding to the cursor point can be reliably chosen by the user from the list.

In reviewing these claims, Applicant discovered that they were somewhat awkwardly worded. Claims 11, 14 and 19 have now been amended for clarification. Thus, the claims more clearly describe that the cursor defines both (1) a predetermined area on the map (e.g., a circle) and (2) a cursor point that identifies a specific location on the map within the predetermined area. A list of POIs falling in the predetermined area of the cursor is displayed, plus the location represented by the cursor point. The user can then select one of the POIs from the list or the cursor point location, e.g., to set the POI or the cursor point location as a destination in a vehicle navigation system. (See, e.g., the application at Fig. 1A-C and p. 5, line 3 to p. 6, line 15; and Fig. 8A-G and p. 9, lines 1 to 29 for support.)

Kaplan does not disclose this subject matter. The Examiner points to Figs. 5-9 and 16 of Kaplan as showing a cursor indicating a predetermined area and a cursor point on a displayed map. Figures 5-9, however, show various menus for selecting POIs, but show no cursor that is movable relative to a displayed map and no cursor point identifying a location on the map. Fig. 16 does show a map image and a circle 268 that can be moved by a user to highlight a single point of interest. However, Fig. 16 and the accompanying text do not disclose that the circle 268 has a cursor point identifying a location on the map, and do not describe or suggest that a list is displayed which includes the name(s) of POIs located in a predetermined area defined by the cursor **and** the location corresponding to a cursor point.

In conclusion, Applicant submits that the claims as amended herein are patentable over the cited art and respectfully requests reconsideration and expedited allowance of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks. Should the Examiner deem a telephone conference to be of assistance in advancing the application to allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney James P. Naughton at (312) 321-4723.

Respectfully submitted,


James P. Naughton
Registration No. 30,665
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200